

## United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/045,400	11/29/2001	Chulso Moon	P-CAN 1004	. 4431	
22907 BANNIER & W	7590 12/31/2007 /ITCOFF, LTD.	EXAMINER			
1100 13th STR			YU, MISOOK		
SUITE 1200 WASHINGTON, DC 20005-4051		•	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
Wiginitalo			1642	_	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
	•		12/31/2007	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

4 + 1		Application No.		Applicant(s)					
Office Action Summary				MOON ET AL.					
		10/045,400							
		Examiner		Art Unit					
	The MAN INC DATE of this communication can	MISOOK YU	r sheet with the c	1642 orrespondence ad	ddress				
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply									
WHIC - Exte after - If NC - Failu Any	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY CHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DANSIONS of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. Operiod for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period of the toreply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing ed patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS CO 36(a). In no event, how will apply and will expire cause the application t	OMMUNICATION ever, may a reply be tim SIX (6) MONTHS from o become ABANDONE	N. nely filed the mailing date of this of (35 U.S.C. § 133).					
Status									
1)⊠	Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>05 O</u>	ctober 2007.							
	This action is <b>FINAL</b> . 2b)⊠ This action is non-final.								
3)	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is								
	closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.								
Disposit	ion of Claims								
5)□ 6)⊠ 7)□	Claim(s) 1,45-48,50-54,56 and 58-66 is/are per 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw Claim(s) is/are allowed. Claim(s) 1,45-48,50-54,56, and 58-66 is/are Claim(s) is/are objected to. Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	wn from consider	ration.						
	tion Papers								
10)	The specification is objected to by the Examine The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) acc Applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examine The specification is objected to be specification.	epted or b) ob drawing(s) be held tion is required if the	l in abeyance. Se ne drawing(s) is ob	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). jected to. See 37 (					
Priority	under 35 U.S.C. § 119								
<ul> <li>12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).</li> <li>a) All b) Some * c) None of:</li> <li>1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.</li> <li>2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No.</li> <li>3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).</li> <li>* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.</li> </ul>									
	ice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) [	Interview Summary						
2) Not 3) Info	ice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) ormation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) per No(s)/Mail Date	5) <u> </u>	i						

10/045,400 Art Unit: 1642

## **DETAILED ACTION**

Claims 1, 45-48, 50-54, 56, and 58-66 are pending and under consideration.

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 53, 54, 56, and 58-66 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Inbal et al., 1997, Nature 390:180-184 in view of Esteller et al., of record (1999, IDS, pages 67-70).

Claims 52, 53, 54, 56, and 58-66 are drawn to method of assessing aggressiveness of a NSCLC tumor in a human comprising assessing expression of the gene encoding DAP-kinase in lung cells of the human, whereby a lower degree of expression of the gene is an indication that the tumor is aggressive, wherein a more aggressive treatment is selected when lower expression is detected.

Inbal et al., 1997, Nature 390:180-184, teach that lower expression of DAP exhibit highly aggressive metastatic behavior in murine lung cancer models.

The studies in Inbal et al., are done using murine lung cancer models. In other words, Inbal et al., do not teach DAP expression in human NSCLC tumors. However, Esteller et al., of record (1999, IDS, pages 67-70) teach a method of assessing NSCLC tumorigenesis at various stages including in early stage in human comprising assessing expression of the gene encoding DAP-kinase in lung cells of the human patients with

10/045,400 Art Unit: 1642

NSCLC. See the *Abstract* and *Materials and Methods* on page 67 and *Results* on page 68. The incidence of DAP-kinase promoter hypermethylation was observed in 5 of the 22 patients. See the Patient Numbers 1, 64, 84, 106 and 112, wherein patients 84 and 106 have an early stage, i.e., diagnostic stage I NSCLC tumor. See Table 1. In contrast, **none** of the 22 paired lung **normal** tissues exhibited abnormal promoter hypermethylation of any gene. See page 68, second column, the last sentence of the top paragraph. Esteller et al also state that silencing of tumor suppressor genes by promoter hypermethylation is a common feature in human cancer. Moreover, the loss of expression of the DAP kinase gene had been correlated with metastatic potential in experimental lung cancer models. On the basis of these observations, they examined 22 NSCLC patients to detect abnormal promoter hypermethylation in genes including DAP kinase in primary tumors. See the third paragraph at the second column on page 67.

Thus, it would have been *prima facie* obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to arrive the claimed invention with a reasonable expectation of success, given Esteller et al teach all the necessary reagents for detection, and Inbal et al., teach aggressiveness of tumor when DAP expression is lost. One of ordinary skill would have been motivated to use more aggressive treatment for more aggressive tumor.

Claims 1, 45-48, 50-51 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Inbal et al., 1997, Nature 390:180-184 in view of Esteller et al., of record (1999,

10/045,400 Art Unit: 1642

⊯ قىد ق

IDS, pages 67-70) as applied to claims 53, 54, 56, and 58-66 above, and further in view of Field et al. of record (IDS filed on Nov. 08, 2004).

The claims are drawn to a method of diagnosing non-small cell lung cancer (NSCLC) in a human, the method comprising assessing expression of the gene encoding DAP-kinase in lung cells of the human, whereby a lower degree of expression of the gene in the human relative to a normal level of expression of the gene in humans not afflicted with NSCLC is an indication that the human is afflicted with NSCLC, wherein the sample being used is a bronchial lavage.

See the teachings of Inbal et al., and Esteller et al., above.

Neither Inbal et al., nor Esteller et al., teach detection of DAP-kinase in bronchial lavage.

However, Field et al., teach that DNA detection is possible in sample from bronchial lavage.

Thus, it would have been *prima facie* obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to arrive at the claimed invention with a reasonable expectation of success because Field et al., teach bronchial lavage sample is being used for detection of early NSCLC markers.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to MISOOK YU whose telephone number is 571-272-0839. The examiner can normally be reached on 8 A.M. to 5:30 P.M., every other Friday off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Larry Helms can be reached on 571-272-0832. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

10/045,400 Art Unit: 1642

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

MISOOK YU Primary Examiner Art Unit 1642

/Misook Yu/